

DRAFT¹
SWAC Beyond Waste Subcommittee Meeting #1 Notes
May 29, 2003

The first meeting of the SWAC Beyond Waste Subcommittee Process convened at 9:00 a.m. in Seattle, Washington. Attending the meeting were: Chris Chapman, Marc Daudon, Dennis Durbin, Gene Eckhardt, Dan Gee, Lorie Hewitt, Jeff Kelley-Clarke, Norm LeMay, Brad Lovaas, Josh Marx, Nancy Mears, Suellen Mele, Jim Sells, Jerry Smedes, Cheryl Smith, Cullen Stephenson, Damon Taam, Sally Toteff, and Holly Wescott. Dee Endelman facilitated the meeting, and Ginny Ratliff took notes.

Meeting Purpose and Collaborative Process

The facilitator began by stating that the purpose of the meeting was to gather input from business, government and other stakeholders to further shape the Solid Waste recommendations designed to achieve the Beyond Waste Vision (Attachment #1). She explained that the desired outcomes from this first meeting were for the group to gain an understanding of the Beyond Waste Project as a whole (vision, underlying concepts, recommended initiatives, other related efforts, group's role, and what will happen with their input), as well as to agree on ground rules and a recommended collaborative approach to these discussions.

After a round of introductions, the facilitator provided an overview of the collaborative process and a working definition for the group. In the context of these discussions, collaboration means listening to one another and giving feedback to Ecology that will make Beyond Waste work in ways that respect the interests of various stakeholder interests (Attachment #2). She recommended a set of ground rules for the group to follow, both procedural and behavioral (Attachment #3), and shared tools for building trust and communication and for resolving differences based on interests (Attachments #4, #5). She also informed the group that during these discussions Ecology does NOT EXPECT:

- That you'll agree with everything Ecology shows you
- People to reach consensus on all issues
- Recommendations "signed off" by every participant for their stakeholder group

She then shared Ecology's expectations:

- You will all agree to work productively with the ideas to help them work for various stakeholder groups

¹ Finalized notes will include the attachments referred to in this document.

- You recognize that Ecology has to retain responsibility for the final product and others will have input
- You will work to understand the interests expressed and work at giving feedback that respects those interests

She asked the participants what their expectations were of Ecology. Participants listed the following expectations:

- Ability to review work products from these meetings
- End up with a unified, comprehensive plan that treats wastes of various sorts in a tidy manner
- If you're unable to attend, that there's still a way of making comments on the topic
- What we do here will truly be influential – towards some substantive direction – get feedback about our work and how it is used
- Ongoing communication with participants regarding results
- Input to this planning process from other places (e.g., DOT, DNR)
- When we address how to deal with jurisdictional issues, we'll also look at the private side

The facilitator explained the different options for decision-making and explained that this group's role was "consultative," that Ecology would be making final decisions about Beyond Waste after consulting with this group and other stakeholders throughout the state (Attachment #6). She indicated however, that wherever possible, Ecology would prefer that decisions were made jointly with the various stakeholders. The Subcommittee participants accepted the ground rules and expectations.

Overview: Beyond Waste Project²

Cheryl Smith, Project Manager for the Solid Waste portion of the Beyond Waste Project, provided the group with the background and evolution of the Project (Attachment #7). The Beyond Waste Project resulted from initial work to revise the statewide Solid Waste Plan that transformed into a collaborative effort to incorporate both solid and hazardous waste into a statewide plan for the future. To do this, the Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) recommended broadening efforts to include additional stakeholders and chartered this Subcommittee to hold informal discussions to provide key input to the plan and implementation strategies. She stressed that the initiatives

² Throughout these notes, participants asked questions for clarification and made comments about various portions of the presentation. To keep questions and comments in an orderly fashion, we have included them in a separate section of the notes, entitled "SWAC Beyond Waste Meeting # 1: Questions and Comments".

presented to the group are works in progress and that the Subcommittee's feedback is critical to shaping and refinement of the Plan.

Cheryl presented projections of the future if our system continues on its same consumptive path (Attachment #8--PowerPoint presentation). While waste generation and the demand for natural resources are both on the rise, the resources necessary to manufacture many of the products we consume are diminishing. And, once these resources are used, they are often re-deposited back into the environment in forms that are ultimately harmful to the water we drink, the air we breathe, and the soil in which we grow our food. As a result, unless there is a change in strategy, there could be a significant risk to health and welfare of state residents, along with the potential for shortages of the resources we rely upon. Cheryl noted that we currently have in place a management system that works for the present (including elements of financial assistance, technical assistance, management plans, recognition programs, reporting requirements, management regulations, and reduction and recycling goals). However, these measures cannot be relied upon to sustain our state into the long-term future.

Beyond Waste Vision

Cheryl explained the long-range Vision for the Beyond Waste Project. Development of the Vision was based on input from and discussions with many stakeholder groups throughout the state. The Vision states: "We can transition to a society where wastes are viewed as inefficient and most wastes are eliminated (waste = things that don't have value). This will contribute to environmental, economic, and social vitality."

She explained the accomplishments to date of the Project, including the joint Vision Statement, consultant research (resulting in 7 issue papers), 10 solid waste background papers, 10 hazardous waste issue papers, and extensive stakeholder outreach. She provided the group with the planning schedule for Beyond Waste, with Spring 2004 as the target date for finalizing the Plan. She stressed the necessity of partnering with local, state, and federal governments as well as industry, non-profit, and household sectors of our state economy in order to achieve the Beyond Waste Vision.

She also reiterated that the current solid waste system has been highly responsive to changing needs and is operating efficiently. The problem that Beyond Waste is trying to address is the way in which resources are used, from extraction to manufacture, consumption, and disposal as waste. The visionary part of the Plan is that waste will be viewed – to the extent possible – as a resource and it will, therefore, be assigned value in our economy. This resource would have to be transferred and brokered, creating economic vitality.

The group engaged in a discussion of various aspects of the Beyond Waste Vision and its place in the statewide Solid Waste Plan. Business participants suggested that some

stakeholders might view the Beyond Waste Plan as confusing and problematic. Other participants supported the “Beyond Waste” title as an easily understood, accurate reflection of the Plan’s intent. The group talked about the importance of performance measures that include economic vitality and communicating the Plan in a way that it could speak to various stakeholder groups successfully.

Overview of Consultant’s Work

Next, Marc Daudon of Cascadia Consulting explained that Beyond Waste is in concert with the Governor’s Sustainable Washington Advisory Panel plan. Within the next generation, the idea is to move to an economy that generates significantly less waste and toxicity, reducing energy use and using it more efficiently, with greater use of renewable energy, improved education, and less extraction of natural resources.

Ecology hired a team of consultants, led by Cascadia Consulting and Ross & Associates, to research several areas of interest for the Beyond Waste Project. The Cascadia-Ross team answered the following questions in a set of 7 issue papers (to be made available to the Subcommittee):

1. What are the major waste streams in the state we have to deal with? What are the important substances/materials?
2. What materials and waste flows are likely to be important in the future?
3. How can we maximize value to society of these materials and wastes?
4. Who are the primary users/generators of key material flows?
5. What potential decision points (among waste generators) can be influenced?
6. Who are the critical customers of each primary user/generator (e.g., shareholders, customers, suppliers, regulators, neighbors)? These groups have influence.
7. What tools/strategies can be deployed and how can they be aligned to encourage Beyond Waste behaviors?

The consulting team also proposed that the following principles be used to guide choices and decision-making in the project:

- The future is unpredictable
- Complex systems sometimes cannot be managed
- The right lever can move the world
- Forces of change can provide valuable coat tails (e.g., lean manufacturing to increase profitability/productivity – now incorporating similar concepts for Beyond Waste)
- Solutions need to address real world constraints: money, political will, competing priorities

Materials Flow Framework

Marc Daudon provided an overview of the Materials Flow Framework (Attachment #9-PowerPoint Presentation) adapted to Washington State. He explained that it is a useful tool to evaluate what materials enter the economy, who uses them, and what materials leave our state. He stated that examining these inputs and outputs assists in identifying waste streams, even if untracked. The consulting team also looked at all types of materials in the economy – biological, technical materials, and unmarketables (PVTs, PCBs, mercury, biologically active compounds, hazardous chemicals). Different economic factors are responsible for different materials, flows, and the order of magnitude of each in our state. He also indicated that, based on employment, 60% of Washington's economy is in the service sector.

He suggested the following approach to implementing the Beyond Waste Vision:

- Maximize material value through the efficient use of resources and materials and recovery and highest use of residuals. Recognize that efficiencies are not going to eliminate waste, and that there will always be a waste-handling component. Try to reduce the number of toxins in the economy.
- Where do we start? Starting points should be based on materials flow by looking at the volume, leverage points, and the best potential for success, momentum and opportunities.
- Recognize the constraints to moving toward Beyond Waste. Currently there is no crisis driving the shift, there is no consensus in state about the problem/solution, there is limited public understanding of the problem and a limited ability to affect most of society's decisions about consumption.
- Determine effective leverage points. In Washington, we can affect change in several ways, including building Beyond Waste partnerships, and business incentives.

Consultant Recommendations

Marc explained that the consulting team made the following seven recommendations based on the materials flow framework analysis:

1. Encourage green building programs
2. Focus on industrial waste generators (e.g., 3M, Toyota have lean manufacturing and zero waste goals)
3. Reduce consumption and toxicity in wholesale and retail sectors
4. Reduce consumption in residential sector
5. Create a technical nutrient cycle

6. Create a viable organics reuse and recycling system where all biological materials and technical nutrients flow into separate streams, with garbage as a third stream
7. Align price signals for Beyond Waste behavior

Throughout the presentation, the group engaged in questions and feedback to both Cheryl and Marc. These are captured in the next section of this document: "SWAC Beyond Waste Meeting #1: Questions and Comments". Overall, the group noted that they did not see any fatal flaws in the materials flow framework.

A number of participants were curious about how the seven recommendations became the five initiatives being considered by this group. Cheryl Smith and Chris Chapman responded that several ideas were wrapped into the five initiatives (e.g., "price signals" are incorporated in various initiatives). Moreover, Ecology staff added another initiative, "Moderate Risk Waste". Cheryl and Chris further indicated that Ecology chose to focus on the five most easily leveraged items first to achieve successes and then go to other initiatives. They also indicated that if something is not in the initiative at this time, it does not mean it will not be addressed at some future time since the plan will be reviewed periodically.

Industrial Waste Initiative

Chris Chapman, Ecology Project Manager for the Hazardous Waste portion of the Beyond Waste Project, presented the Industrial Waste Initiative (Attachment #10). The goal of this initiative is to eliminate solid and hazardous wastes as well as toxic releases from industrial sources. The initiative also addresses reducing the use of virgin materials. Industry produces the majority of hazardous waste in Washington State, as well as 16 percent of the solid waste. As the population increases, wastes will increase and more people will come into contact with disposal areas. Although the current waste management system does a good job of managing certain wastes from industrial facilities, many toxic chemicals are released into the environment through legal discharges, loopholes and exclusions, non-point pollution, and improperly managed hazardous waste. These discharges are creating an ever-increasing toxic burden on the environment and on human health.

Most of the businesses that produce hazardous and toxic waste have close working relationships with the Department of Ecology staff, especially through the Pollution Prevention (P2) planning program. The Department can provide technical support for more waste reduction measures, which can help improve a company's competitiveness in the marketplace. Waste reduction has another benefit for business: instead of adopting an adversarial relationship with business, communities would welcome and encourage environmentally conscious industry. In order to achieve this goal, Ecology would conduct what is known as "sector campaigns" with various waste producing

sectors. The Cascadia-Ross consulting team recommends targeting certain industries: electronics, chemicals, aerospace, national security, and hospitals. Ecology would provide the businesses with a number of incentives and technical support to help them achieve the Beyond Waste goals. Ecology staff members are evaluating the recommended sectors at this time.

The Industrial Initiative represents a fundamental shift in how Ecology has done business because they have a clearer vision of where they hope to go and because of their emphasis in partnering with industry to be successful.

Chris highlighted the 10-30 year goals for the Industrial Waste Initiative:

- More sustainable businesses in Washington
- Less toxic products on market
- Most businesses have environmental management systems (EMS) in place
- Most products purchased by state are environmentally preferred
- Continuous loop recycling systems exist for important waste streams

Moderate risk wastes- hazardous wastes from households and small amounts of hazardous wastes from businesses are mishandled and misused most, and these are causing problems in the environment. Ecology is developing a Moderate Risk Waste Initiative, which will be discussed at the next meeting of this subcommittee, on June 5, 2003. Ecology is also developing performance measures and data systems to track/measure progress toward the Beyond Waste vision. These measures and systems will be reviewed next week also.

Organics Initiative

Cheryl Smith presented an overview of the Organic Waste Initiative, which aims to reduce the generation of organic wastes and recycle as much biodegradable material as possible. Organic waste comprises a large portion of the waste generated in our state (40 percent of the municipal solid waste stream), including food and yard waste, animal manure, and crop residue (Attachment #11). These wastes are bulky, and produce methane, a potent greenhouse gas. Although Washington already composts a large amount of organic materials (mostly yard waste and bio-solids), much more recycling must be done to reduce the contribution of organic waste to landfills. In addition to reducing landfill-bound waste, this initiative aims to better the state's environment and economy through post-consumer waste market projects and small-scale biogas power generation.

Many organic wastes can be recycled into effective agriculture products for use by farms and individuals, reducing the reliance on chemical fertilizers and pesticides while improving overall soil quality. This initiative aims to replace some traditional fertilizers

with recycled organic products, and to build sound statewide markets for recycled soil amendment products. This closed-loop reuse and recycle system will be achieved over the next 30 years by focusing on three main areas:

- Adequate infrastructure across the state for rural, urban, and industrial generators;
- Ensure strong markets to make demands for materials;
- Transform design and regulatory system that supports recovering these materials after they are reduced as much as can.

For the Organics Initiative to be successful, she stated that we need to address the public's perception of organic product quality and any barriers to marketing. In our local communities we can compost in our back yards and have worm bins. Technical assistance is going to be key to having these materials handled correctly.

Green Building Initiative

Cheryl then presented the Green Building Initiative. Construction and demolition makes up approximately 25 percent of the municipal waste stream (Attachment #12). The goal of the Green Building Initiative is to dramatically shift the building practices in Washington to reduce waste, use less toxic materials, and reuse and recycle construction and demolition materials. The concept of green building encompasses five broad areas: sustainable site planning, conservation of materials and resources, use of efficient and renewable energy, safeguarding water and water efficiency, and indoor air quality. In addition, this initiative would promote sustainability in the harvesting of natural resources. Green building currently occupies a small but growing niche in Washington's multi-billion dollar construction industry. Aggressive encouragement of green building will create a healthier environment for people, as well as preserve increasingly scarce natural resources in the state.

To achieve the Beyond Waste Vision, this initiative aims to make green building the standard, not the exception, in Washington State. A viable deconstruction (dismantle and reuse, instead of demolition) industry will need to be in place, as well as an infrastructure and markets for resale and use of reclaimed materials. Architecture and design practices must also be adapted to create buildings that use reclaimed and less toxic materials, generate less waste, and can be disassembled and recycled at the end of their usable lives. State government can lead the industry toward green building through a number of avenues, including: education, regulatory changes, tax credits, certification programs, promotion of residential green building programs, and instituting green building standards and purchasing requirements for state government buildings. Over the next thirty years, this initiative aims to convert almost all construction to adherence to green building standards.

Initial Discussion of the Initiatives

After the three initiatives were presented, Ecology Staff asked the group if they felt these were the right opportunities to take advantage of. The group seemed in general agreement that these initiatives made sense. Comments included: “The areas hit upon are those that get the biggest bang for the buck – high volume, problem areas.”

Ecology staff cited other groups they hope to meet with in the near-term to gather their feedback, including Washington Organics Recycling Council, local governments handling hazardous/moderate risk waste in Pasco; Cascadia Green Building Council; and the Solid Waste Policy Forum. Washington Citizens for Resource Conservation shared their newsletter with the group.

The facilitator drew the group’s attention to “Questions to Contemplate Regarding the Beyond Waste Initiatives (Attachment #13)” as they are preparing to discuss each initiative in greater depth at next week’s meeting. She also stated they would be discussing performance indicators.

Meeting Evaluation

To conclude the day’s event, the facilitator asked the group to evaluate the meeting. Aspects they liked about the meeting:

- Lots of opinions expressed
- Facilitator grasps materials quickly
- Number of breaks to talk
- Background materials helpful
- Good lunch

Changes the group recommended for future meetings:

- Backlighting is problematic
- Room is too long

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m. The second meeting will be on Thursday, June 5, 2003 (Attachment #14).

Questions and comments raised during the meeting are included as Appendix A.

Appendix A

BEYOND WASTE MEETING #1 Q&A and Specific Comments:

The following are questions and answers that were brought up throughout the meeting.

Is Beyond Waste (BW), Washington State's waste plan?

Yes, there are statutory directives requiring 20-year plans for solid and hazardous waste. Because of this plan's far-reaching vision, Ecology proposes using a 30-year planning horizon. The Beyond Waste process is different from previous planning Ecology has done because this is an iterative, community-based process involving greater stakeholder participation.

What will Ecology do with the information presented here?

It will be reviewed and incorporated along with other comments, into the overall BW Plan that will be presented to statewide audiences for comment over the next year.

Will there be a report written about our discussions?

Not per se. Because these discussions are informal, Ecology plans to use the meeting notes as this group's work product.

Will this Subcommittee have an opportunity to review and revise the meeting notes?

Yes, the meeting notes will be developed in a draft form for the group to review and revise before they are finalized. Because the second meeting is only a week away, the notes from the May 29 meeting will be brought to June 5 meeting.

Will our recommendations be presented to SWAC?

The meeting notes will be reviewed by SWAC. Any resulting changes to the Plan based on this group's input will be highlighted for the SWAC.

What happened to all the information that was presented at the Roundtable Discussions?

All the issues and information developed during the Roundtable Discussions has been used in our development of the BW vision and initiatives. For example, local governments discussed funding in these discussions and we have included this topic in the BW Plan.

What is the linkage between the previous Roundtable Discussions and BW's vision?

The Roundtable report had two components — themes that were consistent across the state and then a detailed discussion of the meetings' results at various locations. In the first part of the report, there was a longer vision statement; the BW vision statement is an abbreviated form of the Roundtable vision statement. Ecology staff encourage further discussion if this shortened version doesn't reflect the message of the longer vision statement.

Who signs the Plan?

Ecology is accountable to develop statewide plans on hazardous waste and solid waste. State law does not specify an approval process or specific authority for the Solid Waste Plan. Ecology's intent is to encourage stakeholder support for implementing the Plan actions.

Shouldn't BW get input from others like DOT, Energy, and DNR that SW industry influences and is influenced by?

Yes. In the five focus areas, Ecology is attempting to involve all the stakeholders who should be at the table. Participants are encouraged to suggest others who should be given the opportunity to comment on BW.

How does the statewide Plan affect county and city plans?

The state Plan is advisory to the local plans. The statewide Plan should serve as a guide for everyone involved in SW system, and once the statewide Plan is completed, Ecology hopes locals will begin following and adopting the BW approach in their jurisdictions.

In BW, will there be consideration of how to finance local government programs and the recouping of investment in the current solid waste system by the private sector?

Yes, we will present some ideas about financing local government programs at Meetings 3 and 4.

If we're going to move to BW and yet still have a robust economy, are all assumptions open? One example is how our state's hazardous/dangerous waste statutes are more restrictive than the federal regulations. On the less restrictive side, however, this participant cited the recent rule change on pharmaceutical waste.

Ecology says it wants to partner with industry to get to point of environmental excellence in the state and expressed willingness to look at all possibilities. One of the reasons for performance indicators is to track not only the environmental success of Beyond Waste Initiatives but also economic vitality.

Wouldn't it be easier to explain BW as "special waste" – waste that is a viable commodity that can be put back into our economy and not endanger our environment?

There will be always be waste, but we want to look for alternatives to waste – looking up the production stream to promote manufacturing of products that are easy to break down and reuse in some form.

Isn't the underlying economic system the problem because the cost of goods does not necessarily include environmental costs to produce and distribute that good? Won't suggesting a paradigm shift necessitate a raise in prices?

The Plan is not going to normalize environmental economics; however, the Plan would be remiss if price considerations were not somehow addressed.

In the context of BW, is "waste" a noun or a verb?

Both. It is the end material that has no value, *and* it is the act of wasting resources.

Various questions were asked about sustainability, including how not to hurt the economy, handling population growth, the cost of creating a new system versus the benefits derived from that system (e.g., generating energy from garbage).

The point of sustainability is to create positive change in our state economy without impacting our economy negatively. The term "sustainability" does not appear in the Beyond Waste vision statement. The vision refers to a period of transition, where change will occur over time. The vision also refers to eliminating most wastes, not all wastes. Economic, societal and environmental benefits should result from this effort.

Does the Industrial Initiative summary include organics in a special or direct way (oil, antifreeze, solvents)? Is organics only for things within the carbon chain? What are the bridges between the plans and can they be spelled out clearly?

Organics can affect both hazardous and solid waste (e.g., pesticides) and that relationship is not thoroughly spelled out yet within the various key initiatives. Ecology didn't assume oil/solvents would be dealt with in the Organics Initiative; rather, it is in the industrial initiative.

What are the differences between the consultant papers and staff papers?

In 2001, 10 solid waste papers were written to better identify important topics to address in this Plan. They were written by workgroups that included state and local government staff, some NGO representatives and some private sector representatives. The issue papers are on the Beyond Waste Project Web site (www.ecy.wa.gov/beyondwaste) and covered:

The Cascadia-Ross consulting team wrote 7 issue papers (which will be made available to participants)

- 1) Materials Flow Framework;
- 2) An overview of the initiatives, defining why each was chosen;
- 3) Organics;
- 4) Industrial Wastes
- 5) Green Building
- 6) Pollution prevention planning program enhancements
- 7) Performance measures and data tracking

Ecology Hazardous Waste staff is finalizing a number of issue papers. They are not available yet, but cover topics like compliance, education, history and background, data management, etc.

Can we have a definition for "sustainable" business?

Many different definitions exist around the term "sustainability." One definition that is often used refers to meeting the needs of today while not harming the ability of future generations to get their needs met. The Ecology Web site (www.ecy.wa.gov) includes a Web page on sustainability and lots of information is included there about various definitions.

If Beyond Waste is trying to build a sustainable economy through markets, yet reduce organics with worm bins, etc., does that make economic sense?

Ecology's goal is to optimize which organic waste gets into the stream. Forty percent of what's in solid waste stream is organic and we anticipate there will always be organic materials in the waste stream.

Do paper and recovered paper products fall into technical nutrients or organics definition?

Depending on the paper, it can be organic or technical.

Comment: Spokane has a waste energy plant and there are other opportunities for excess organics that can be used in that manner.

Does the Green Building Initiative recommend requiring LEED standards?

Yes, the 3-year goal is for all state government buildings to be generating less waste, incorporate fewer toxins, and become easier to disassemble and reuse. Green building is not a requirement to be imposed on other buildings. (A follow-up comment: In Spokane we have buildings built to this standard, it costs money to get certification. There's no need to get an auditor and get it certified [this is an impediment].)

The following are comments that were made throughout the meeting.

One participant noted that in the Roundtable Meetings held in 2001, discussions indicated that the term "zero waste" was a problem. Materials and papers distributed since that time have not included the concept of "zero waste" because of the concerns it raised. Another participant suggested "zero waste of resources" was a better term, and one that would be supported by business and industry stakeholders.

The term "Beyond Waste" raises concerns. Everyone thinks of exceptions. If we're going to recycle everything, that's fine. But Beyond Waste does not make common sense.

We have created a waste handling system that is so efficient that consumers never think about their own waste. There needs to be considerable education to get people to change their thinking. Also, however reusable waste is transferred in the BW future, it needs to be a system that is convenient to use.

Some haulers are moving to single source co-mingled stream collection. Large recyclers are concerned about that because while they're getting more material, it's of poorer quality due to higher levels of contamination.

One participant suggested including a description of how effective the current solid waste management system is and the continued usefulness of this system in providing the essential infrastructure in the long-term vision of BW.

One participant commented on how Washington State is doing much more than the rest of the country on this issue and the reluctance of the public to pay for current services. He didn't see a crisis looming, but rather suggested that the system should do a better of serving and educating the public on the issues.

One participant stated that the title “BW” doesn’t represent the intent of the Project nor the initiatives well and are likely to be met with resistance.

Another participant said that the Beyond Waste title reflects the intent of the Plan well, and is easy for the public to understand.

One participant suggested there was a communication difference. Calling it a “BW Vision” is a more acceptable way to communicate the concept rather than a BW Plan because it is confusing and potentially threatening to industries operating in this realm.

When the background information was presented on BW, one participant questioned which resources are going to run out and when.

One participant appreciated the expanded definitions of organics. However, he questioned whether the initiative on industrial waste would prevent industries from moving to Washington or result in their leaving.

During the discussion of the Industrial Initiative, one participant encouraged making the Plan broad enough so that if local governments wanted to do something, it wouldn’t prohibit it.

One participant wondered how Ecology would work with local governments so all these new initiatives do not fall upon them, especially ones that are not on Ecology’s priority list.

One participant suggested adding a goal to Beyond Waste of increasing business and jobs in Washington and point out how this will help, not hinder jobs and business growth in our state.